

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in reply to the Office Action dated March 13, 2007. Claims 1, 37, 47 and 48 have been amended. No new matter has been added to the Claims. A Petition for One Month Extension of Time and Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement are submitted herewith. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Office Action rejected Claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The Office Action stated the language “the symbols” has insufficient antecedent basis in such Claim.

Applicants have made certain amendments to Claim 37 to overcome the rejection.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action rejected Claims 1 to 9, 24, 37, 39 to 45 and 47 to 51 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,190,255 B1 to Thomas et al. (“Thomas”). Though Applicants respectfully disagree with such rejection, Applicants have made certain amendments to Claims 1, 37, 47 and 48 to advance the prosecution of this application. Specifically, amended Claim 1 recites, among other elements, “a primary game operable for one or more plays based upon one or more wagers by a player; a plurality of different game display interfaces available for a single one of the plays based upon a single one of the wagers in the primary game and operable to be displayed by the display device to represent said primary game to the player . . .” and “an event that causes the display device to switch from displaying one of the interfaces for the single play of said primary game to another one of the interfaces for the single play of said primary game.”

Thomas discloses a bonus game for a slot machine. Thomas’ display changes only after the player makes a new wager to start a new bonus game. Contrary to Thomas, the gaming devices of amended claims 1, 37, 47 and 48 each define a plurality of different display interfaces which are available for a single play of the game based on

a single wager. For at least the reasons stated above, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 37, 47 and 48 (and the Claims which depend therefrom) are patentably distinguished over Thomas.

Claim 37 also recites “. . . a menu operable to be displayed to the player that displays the symbols of the interfaces to the player, wherein the symbols in each interface perform an identical function in the primary game with respect to corresponding symbols in the other interfaces, and wherein a plurality of the corresponding symbols in the interfaces are visually different from one another . . .” The Office Action states that Thomas discloses a menu operable to be displayed to the player in the form of a payable. Applicants respectfully disagree. The payable disclosed in Thomas displays amounts of credits awarded for various combinations of symbols, not the menu defined by Claim 37. Specifically, the payable in Thomas is not a menu displaying symbols of different interfaces where a plurality of the symbols perform identical functions with symbols in different interfaces. For this additional reason, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 37 (and the Claims which depend therefrom), are patentably distinguished over Thomas.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office Action rejected Claims 10, 24 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Thomas in view of “what is known to one of ordinary skill in the art.” Applicants respectfully disagree with such rejection, and Applicants submit that Claims 10, 24 and 46 are patentable over such combination for reasons similar to those submitted with respect to Claims 1 and 38.

The Office Action rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Thomas in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,058,552 to Walker et al. (“Walker”). Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 11 and 12 are patentably distinguished over Thomas in view of Walker for reasons similar to those submitted with respect to Claim 1.

The Office Action rejected Claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being obvious over Thomas in view of Walker. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 38 is patentably

distinguished over Thomas in view of Walker for reasons similar to those submitted with respect to Claim 37.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the Claims submitted with this Response are in condition for allowance. An earnest endeavor has been made to place this application in condition for allowance, and such allowance is courteously solicited. If the Examiner has any questions related to this Response, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY 

Renato L. Smith

Reg. No. 45,117

Cust. No. 29159

Dated: June 22, 2007